

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD**

**BANNUM PLACE OF SAGINAW**

**and**

**Case 07-CA-207685  
07-CA-215356**

**LOCAL 406, INTERNATIONAL  
BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS (IBT)**

**and**

**ERNIE AHMAD**

**Case 07-CA-211090**

**ORDER<sup>1</sup>**

The Employer's Petition to Revoke subpoena duces tecum B-1-11EJ5YH is denied. The subpoena seeks information relevant to the matters under investigation and describes with sufficient particularity the evidence sought, as required by Section 11(1) of the Act and Section 102.31(b) of the Board's Rules and Regulations.<sup>2</sup> Further, the Employer has failed to establish any other legal basis for revoking the subpoena.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

<sup>2</sup> In considering the petition to revoke, we have evaluated the subpoena in light of the Region's statements in its opposition brief that it is willing to limit the time period for the information requested in pars. 1 and 2 to January 1, 2017 to the present, as well as to limit the scope of the discipline/discharges to infractions of theft of time, job abandonment, attendance violations, work performance, insubordination, and failure to follow the Charged Party's Prison Rape Enforcement Act (PREA) policy; that it modifies its requests in pars. 6 and 11 to exclude documents reflecting employee medical information and to permit the redaction of employee social security numbers, birth dates, and banking information; and that it limits the scope of par. 8 to the date that the Employer's Director was hired and to documents constituting internal emails to and from the Director.

<sup>3</sup> To the extent that the Employer has provided some of the requested material, it is not required to produce that information again, provided that the Employer accurately describes which documents under subpoena it has already provided, identifies to which subpoena paragraph(s) they are responsive, states whether those previously-provided

See generally *NLRB v. North Bay Plumbing, Inc.*, 102 F.3d 1005 (9th Cir. 1996); *NLRB v. Carolina Food Processors, Inc.*, 81 F.3d 507 (4th Cir. 1996).

Dated, Washington, D.C., December 17, 2018.

JOHN F. RING,	CHAIRMAN
LAUREN McFERRAN,	MEMBER
MARVIN E. KAPLAN,	MEMBER

---

documents constitute all of the requested documents, and provides all of the information that was subpoenaed.